

Illinois U Library

MARCH 24, 1953  
75th BROADCAST

# Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 310 Stations of the ABC Radio Network



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

## Is World Government a Realistic Goal?

Moderator, GUNNAR BACK

### Speakers

CLARENCE STREIT

PIERCE BUTLER



### COMING

—April 7, 1953—

## Is Advertising Responsible for Our High Standard of Living?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 18, No. 44



\$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



# Town Meeting

VOL. 18

No. 44



## Is World Government a Realistic Goal?

The Broadcast of March 24, 1953, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m. EST, over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from Veterans' Memorial Building, Detroit, Michigan, under the auspices of the Detroit Chapter of the United World Federalists.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

### THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

**CLARENCE K. STREIT**—President of the Federal Union, Inc.; author of *Union Now*. Clarence Streit was born in California, Missouri, in 1896 and moved to Montana when he was 15. Majoring in journalism at the State University, he was editor of its student paper, and represented his college in debate. After volunteer service during World War I, he returned to Missoula to complete work on his B.A. He was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship and went to Oxford for further study of history and economics.

In 1921, he resigned his scholarship to marry and to become Rome correspondent of the Philadelphia *Public Ledger*. In 1925 he joined the *New York Times* staff, served as its Vienna and Balkans correspondent, then went to Geneva as the paper's League correspondent for a period of ten years. Reporting League sessions during such crises as the Sino-Japanese war, the disarmament debacle, the fall of the gold standard, the spread of the depression, and the rise of Nazi dictatorship, led Mr. Streit to write the book which appeared in 1939 as *Union Now*. This is a proposal for a Federal Union of the North Atlantic democracies, as the nucleus of a free world government. Federal Union, Inc., an association of which Mr. Streit is president, continues to further the idea. Mr. Streit is also the editor of the illustrated monthly, *Freedom and Union*, and is a member of the Executive Committee of the Atlantic Union Committee, formed in 1949, which concentrates on political action, whereas Federal Union works on the educational side of the problem.

**PIERCE BUTLER**—Chairman of the Executive Committee of the United World Federalists. Mr. Butler, the son of former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Butler, was born and brought up in St. Paul, Minnesota. He was educated at Princeton University and the Harvard Law School, leaving the latter to enter the army in the first World War.

Back in this country, Mr. Butler was admitted to the Bar of Minnesota in 1920 where he has practiced ever since, now as a member of the firm Doherty, Rumble, Butler and Mitchell.

Pierce Butler has served as an officer of the United World Federalists since 1949. In addition to heading the UWF Executive Committee he is also chairman of the organization's Executive Council, an administrative body elected annually.

Both an educational and political organization, the United World Federalists are dedicated to the "support and development of the United Nations into a world federal government with limited powers adequate to assure peace."

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1953, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

# Is World Government a Realistic Goal?

## Announcer:

Tonight Town Meeting comes to you from the beautiful Veterans' Memorial Building in Detroit, Michigan, where we are guests of the Detroit Chapter of the United World Federalists. The organization is dedicated to the support and development of the United Nations into a world federal government with limited powers adequate to insure peace. The Detroit chapter, with a membership of approximately 350, was founded in 1947. Its present chairman is Mr. Merrill O. Bates.

Many world federalist chapters throughout the country are meeting tonight to listen to this program. The Detroit chapter sends greetings to them. Town Meeting travels to all sections of America to bring you free and open discussion of various problems of national and world interest and we are happy to co-operate with local organizations. Now to preside as Moderator for tonight's discussion, here is Gunnar Back of ABC's Washington News Staff.

## Moderator Back:

Thank you very much. Every new day's headlines tell the insecurity and danger of our times and keep dancing before us the grinning specter of a possible World War III. The atom weapon was tested again today in Nevada; the draft will call 19 year-old's in 41 states in April. At the United Nations, a forum of everlasting bitter debate—the Soviet Union charges the United States with fifth column activity in iron-curtain countries. Bernard Baruch tells Congress the next war is likely to explode in a big smash, and we won't have a year or two to debate what to do; the Chinese Reds

make the biggest attack of the year in Korea; General Ridgway denies dissension among allied officers of NATO. That is what we read and hear in one single day.

There are thoughtful Americans now everywhere who are convinced that times are demanding the boldest kind of action. They favor a specific start toward world government, in partial form at least, and in some positive form, as the inescapable road if we're ever to have peace on earth. So tonight on Town Meeting we examine again the concept of world government under the title: "Is World Government a Realistic Goal?" Tonight's speakers have looked at the concept calmly and quietly for a long time and they remain steadfast to the ideal.

Clarence K. Streit jolted many of us 14 years ago with his book called *Union Now*. Once a Rhodes scholar from Montana, once a foreign correspondent for the *New York Times*, Mr. Streit spent 10 years reporting the old League of Nations, and his *Union Now* grew partly out of that failure. Now President of Federal Union, Inc., editor of its magazine *Freedom in Union* and a member of the Board of Governors of the Atlantic Union Committee, Mr. Streit, since 1939, has worked full time writing and speaking for a union of the North Atlantic democracies.

Pierce S. Butler, Jr., is Chairman of the Executive Committee of the United World Federalists. A native of Saint Paul, Mr. Butler was educated at Princeton and at Harvard Law School. A World War I veteran, he is now practicing law in Minnesota. Tonight, from Detroit's handsome new Veterans' Memorial Building, in a

program under the auspices of the Detroit Chapter of the United World Federalists, we fittingly discuss the hope that war memorials will some day not be needed. Mr. Butler, before we ask whether it is realistic, will you tell us first more about the World Federalist plan?

**Mr. Butler:**

When I say that I believe in world government, I mustn't be construed as being in favor of world government as such, or as any form of world government. There are many forms of world government to which I would be bitterly opposed. I am for one form of world government which will permit us here to live our lives in freedom and to preserve our institutions and our Republic. What I have in mind, and what I mean by that, is a change of the United Nations into an organization of all nations with its own agencies empowered and adequate to enforce disarmament and to prevent war by enforceable law and narrowly limited to that function and that purpose alone, enabled to act upon individuals only when their conduct is a clear and present danger of leading to war and then for the purpose of preventing it.

I do not mean a government which abolishes the several nations or may interfere with their domestic matters or bring them all to common cultures, or levels, or impose other institutions upon them, or interfere in the ordinary and daily affairs of men. I mean simply a universal organization which by enforcing law against war and foolproof disarmament can preserve the freedoms of the peoples, including our own.

**Mr. Back:** Thank you very much, Mr. Butler, for that clear statement

of your position, and now Mr. Streit, how far would your Atlantic Union go toward world government?

**Mr. Streit:** Only a world government that is free could possibly be our goal. It is quite unrealistic to assume that many Americans would aim at setting up any government that would not be free, let alone a world government. If you amend the question to read, Is a Free World Government a Realistic Goal, my answer would be, "It should be the eventual goal, but it is not realistic now in the common meaning of the term." It is a distant goal, not one within reach. The realistic goal to me is Senator Kefauver's Atlantic Union Resolution, which has the support of many Senators and Congressmen and such statesmen as former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, the President of the Atlantic Union Committee.

This Atlantic Union Resolution would call a federal convention of delegates from the United States, Canada, Britain, France, Benelux, and other democracies they might invite, to explore whether these founders of the Atlantic alliance can now federate to some degree through an Atlantic Union Government patterned broadly on the American federal constitution. Such a union of the free is the common sense first step toward a free world government, and it is much more besides. Atlantic Union would give the free such great strength, while cutting the cost in the taxes we pay, that freedom could be preserved without war during the long, long period needed for humanity to evolve toward a free world government, or even to the universal disarmament Mr. Butler has been recommending.

Meanwhile, the Atlantic Union would be a member and bulwark of the United Nations and it would be entering into federal relations with other countries and federations as rapidly as practicable for freedom, until gradually a universal free government was attained. But the realistic first step now is to get a convention called to explore the possibility of forming an Atlantic Union. The dangerous situation resulting from Stalin's death makes this Atlantic Federal Convention not only a realistic goal but a most urgent one.

**Mr. Back:** Thank you very much, Mr. Streit. Now it's time to go into this question of how realistic is realistic and who is the most realistic. Mr. Butler, what are the problems, as you see them, so far as arriving at your ideal is concerned?

**Mr. Butler:** Well, I think it goes beyond calling a convention to explore possibilities. Actually in the United Nations you have an assemblage now, and by the terms of its charter that charter automatically comes up for revision in 1955, and there is no need to call conventions to explore. So far as realistic or feasible is concerned, I'll content myself with references to two men. General MacArthur, seven years ago, said that those who advocate a world federal structure are the practical realists of today.

Three years ago last night Eisenhower, then president of Columbia, speaking of a United Nations police of properly defined and restricted, but effective, powers for enforcing peace among the nations, exactly what I have spoken of, said that it is, or should be, within the realm of feasible attainment. That, I think, is an adequate answer

to the realism business. However, Mr. Streit did say something about freedom that interests me. We have here in this country the greatest thing that men have ever devised, in our political and economic system, and it's going to pieces on our hands.

Our freedoms are being restricted; our taxes are such as to imperil that system; we observe daily demands increasing for conformity of thought and expression; we observe the shrinking of the field of individual decision, and we observe the growing concentration of all economic and political power in Washington and in increasing American form of statism. That is due to one simple fact—that a group of men in the Kremlin can use war as an instrument of their personal or national policy. That's what I am trying to avoid, and preserve without a long-drawn process of education of them.

**Mr. Back:** Well, Mr. Streit, you have been fumbling your glasses here waiting for a chance to talk. It's your turn now.

**Mr. Streit:** I'd like to go back to where my friend, Pierce Butler, began. He seemed to think that there was no need exploring anything except along the United Nations scale. He seems to have forgotten, although he quoted President Eisenhower, that we have already found that the United Nations does not suffice to secure our freedom. We had to get together with the other Atlantic democracies and set up a military alliance with them several years ago.

We already have that, and President Eisenhower was the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic military forces in France, and in his first and last report to NATO

he stated, "Peacetime coalitions throughout history have been weak and notoriously inefficient. Nevertheless, we were expecting NATO members to work and sacrifice together over an indefinite period. There is power in our union. Visible and within grasp, we have the capability of building such military, economic, and moral strength as the communist world would never dare to challenge. Then the Atlantic Community will have proved worthy of its history and its God-given endowments."

General Eisenhower said those words which I have quoted from his NATO report, his report to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in April, 1952. So you will see that on the side of realism here, as to how we are going to get the peace to preserve our freedom and prevent the further extension of the sort of thing that I deplore as much as Pierce Butler does, this gradual encroachment upon our liberties, the way to proceed is first among the democratic countries in turning this alliance into a union.

**Mr. Back:** Thank you, Mr. Streit. Do you have a comment on Mr. Streit, Mr. Butler?

**Mr. Butler:** Yes, surely. As I understand it, his suggestion is a stronger political integration of the military alliance of the North Atlantic. Well, the paths of history are paved with the bleached bones of military alliances and of men who confided in them, however closely knit they may have been by political arrangement. That simply means that we keep on arming and expecting the destruction of our Republic just as I've suggested.

This alliance that Mr. Streit speaks of, or union, or whatever it may be called, still has to keep

arming against the Russians on the old balance of power idea, where the security of one is necessarily the insecurity of the other, and the seesaw and the competition keeps up, and we're in exactly the same fix we are now. Nobody likes to go out of a door and find himself back in the same room, as Mr. T. S. Eliot said.

**Mr. Back:** All right, Mr. Streit.

**Mr. Streit:** Mr. Butler seems to have turned against his witness, although the witness is the President of the United States. President Eisenhower, in this report, was condemning these coalitions, the sort of thing that we of the Atlantic Union have condemned, too. Now I don't know what President Eisenhower meant when he referred to Union here—people do use these terms in different ways—but it would seem from his report that he saw the weakness in alliances and coalitions.

It doesn't mean that he wants to change them right away, you've got to deal with practical situations, and I am not professing to say what he believes as President of the United States now. He is in a more responsible and a more difficult position. I was simply answering the quotation that was brought out earlier from President Eisenhower. But I want to stress that what we have in mind in federal union is a federation, a government, patterned on the kind of government we have in the United States. That is not what Mr. Butler is talking about at all, you see.

**Mr. Back:** Some years ago, when I was a lad, I debated in high school, and it was a long time ago too, the building of the St. Lawrence waterway. And even then we proved that it was physi-

cally possible, economically desirable, but the waterway never got built. It was so long ago, now let's plunge into the cold water and talk about Russia and what that problem is with respect to your idea of some world government, Mr. Butler.

**Mr. Butler:** Well, I say of course in any enforceable disarmament arrangement, the Russians have to be included. You don't exempt the burglars from the law; you include them under it. That's why you have the law. There are vast and great ideological differences between the Russians and ourselves, and as far as I am concerned I want to compromise none of them, but it is those very ideological differences which make a clash inevitable. They are not an obstacle to the creation of an enforceable law as between the antagonists. They are what makes that law and that enforcement imperative. That is the first question. Mr. Streit would omit them.

I would say that the very purpose of law is not to bring those two together, but to keep them apart, to keep them from coming together in a collision of violence. That is the function of the policeman. He isn't to bring the honest man together with the thief; he is to stand between them. Now, as to whether the Russians would come along or agree to any arrangement or not, opinions may differ. But at least it's contingent, and certainly self-preservation is worth the try. Now my own feeling is that they would come along, because just as our security is dependent upon all uniting, so is theirs, and it seems just as realistic to believe that their own self-interest will advise adherence

to a universal disarmament as it is to believe the opposite.

**Mr. Back:** Mr. Butler, thank you. Mr. Streit.

**Mr. Streit:** We've all seen what happened when we got into truce negotiations with the communists in Korea—how that has dragged and dragged along. Now does anybody really believe that if we got down to the whole question of arming with the Soviet that they wouldn't drag their feet, that we wouldn't be faced with the same sort of thing that we have in Korea and in the United Nations? That would go on forever, and what would be the result? There would be no real disarmament among the countries where humanitarian ideas can circulate freely, as our own and in England and France and Canada.

This would have its effect on the people, but beyond the iron curtain it wouldn't affect things any more than it did with Hitler when the same disarmament talks went on in the 30's. The result would be to weaken the free people. They would be relaxing, and the Soviet beyond the iron curtain would be strengthening its forces just as the Chinese Reds have been strengthening their forces in Korea, and our boys would be killed in the end as a result of it. I don't see that as a realistic way to get peace.

**Mr. Butler:** Well, the Russians, in spite of all their gyrations, do remain within the United Nations and are very careful not to withdraw from it. I would keep them in the United Nations. I think that's very important.

**Mr. Streit:** So do I.

**Mr. Butler:** But I don't believe that that is an effective basis for maintaining and securing peace. I think that their reason for

staying there is to keep it alive and keep it going while they use it to try to prevent unity in the West so that they have time to subvert, or to court, the rest of the world who are neither North Atlantic Treaty adherents nor of the Russian group. The majority of mankind are in neither group. And rather than lose them and have them arrayed against them, the Russians would come along in any arrangement for enforceable disarmament, and the others who are as yet uncommitted would certainly, I think, from motives of sheer self-interest, adhere to any arrangement of universal and enforceable disarmament, because then all would be underwriting the security of each.

**Mr. Back:** All right, Mr. Streit.

**Mr. Streit:** I would like to have a few words to say how I think we can overcome this problem of Soviet Russia. I believe that we must break up the military power of the Soviet system. We must do it without war, and we can do it without war if we act now when Stalin's death has given us a remarkable opportunity, as well as a very great danger. Now the opportunity is that the Soviet system was shot through with distrust, suspicion, in normal times. An outfit like that, that is based on force, you can be sure is not going to abolish its arms abroad any more than its secret police at home if it can help it. They have this suspicion that runs through their whole country and through their relations with eastern Europe where I used to work as a correspondent.

Stalin's death has made the uncertainty and the suspicion even greater. There is no one there that can trust anyone in the upper ranks. Now, that can lead to a

division among us. I wouldn't be surprised if the Soviets themselves would try to talk disarmament or something like that, a phony peace, so that we would relax and become divided among ourselves and with our allies. That's what I fear would come under those circumstances. But if, instead, we do what Stalin told them they could bank on us never doing, and that is to unite, for the Atlantic capitalist democracies, as he called them, to form a union or even to start it, it would be the surprise of the century to them.

It would give new hope to the people in Poland who have so many ties with us right here in Detroit, for example, with the Czechs, with the Hungarians, with the Bulgarians, the Rumanians, the East Germans, these people with whom I worked as a newspaper correspondent. I know their attachments and their links with us. If we start trying to make a United States of the Atlantic, then you can really create suspicion, unrest, and disruption in the Soviet empire and begin to break it down.

**Mr. Back:** Thank you, Mr. Streit. Well, we raised the question before, Mr. Butler, the question of the Soviet Union, and I think speaking of questions, question marks are still written over the faces of many in the audience. That's a big obstacle. Now perhaps we ought to turn to an obstacle to your proposal of the North Atlantic Union and that is this, if we are finding it so difficult now to get the NATO countries to co-operate with us in this common defense effort, what are your problems in establishing a union of these countries in which there would be a form of government?

**Mr. Streit:** We have problems, very great problems there, but if

we can't get them done in this area where we have the most in common, most of our citizenry came from these Western European countries, many of our institutions did. We have a community spirit there, if we have anywhere in the world among a number of nations. Now if we have the difficulties, as we certainly do, even in getting an agreement with Canada on certain things, with the British, the Dutch, the Belgians, the French, with these countries, it seems to me we're going to have much more with the others.

So we would start in this very realistic way of getting together a federal convention like the one in Philadelphia in 1787. Why, people said at that time, even George Washington said at that time, that the people aren't ready for this. It isn't possible; it can't be done. But he went there; he tried; he explored; we got our government here. I think, and many of us, all of us in the Atlantic Union, believe that if we got together here on the federal basis, explored the federal way out of it; we would have a much better opportunity of reaching agreement among these democratic countries than we could possibly have on the present alliance basis.

**Mr. Back:** Thank you, Mr. Streit. Any comment on that, Mr. Butler, before we turn to some very specific things to come from this audience?

**Mr. Butler:** Yes, on the question of realism. Somehow to me it seems much more realistic to believe that the people of this country and of other countries will adhere to an organization which has as its objective, and is narrowly limited merely to disarmament, to mere self preservation, to the mere prevention of their murdering of

each other, than they will to any union, though lesser in number, which embraces what Mr. Streit termed the United States of the North Atlantic. That is to say, regulation, at least in large measure, by the union of the domestic affairs of each nation, such as trade, immigration, revenues, is perfectly unrealistic to my mind. Do you think that the people of this country at this time, if unwilling to go merely to disarmament, are nevertheless willing to go much further, as he suggests?

**Mr. Streit:** What we are proposing is a convention to explore how far they can go in these directions, Mr. Butler. You are assuming that they would go all the way. I would much prefer that, but the thing that we propose is an exploration to see just how far we can go, and it does seem to me a little strange to call that unrealistic on the trade side here in Detroit, whose board of Commerce has recently begun to lead a very wonderful campaign in favor of freer trade.

**Mr. Back:** Mr. Streit, each week on America's Town Meeting, we may get back to this matter of freer trade, each week we ask our speakers to discuss a question sent in by a listener. We feel that in this way all of our listeners have an opportunity to participate directly in Town Meeting. Tonight the question chosen as most appropriate by our program staff comes from Miss Sylvia Miller of 1610 Park Road, Northwest, in Washington, D. C., and Miss Miller's question is this: Assuming that there must be some basic ingredient to bind people together if they are to form any sort of a world government that will last, is the desire for protection against

aggression enough to form that lasting union?

**Mr. Butler:** Yes.

**Mr. Back:** The answer is yes. All right, Mr. Streit.

**Mr. Streit:** My answer is no. You have to have much more to form a government or to get even a disarmament agreement. You have to have much more than just a desire to avoid or prevent aggression. The thing that struck me in the League of Nations during the world disarmament conference was the piles and piles of petitions there and the cases there from all over the world, any amount of willingness to disarm, yet the machinery wasn't there for doing it. There wasn't

enough community of spirit. There was too much diversity among not only the various countries of the world but certainly among the great armed groups, such as the dictatorships, as opposed to the democratic countries. You have to have a common political concept as well as the desire to avoid war.

**Mr. Back:** Thank you, Mr. Streit. Well, gentlemen, now comes the work. The audience has been waiting. They feel there were a lot of voids in what we've said so far. So let's turn to the questions here in Detroit, Michigan, in this beautiful auditorium of the Veterans' Memorial Building. Question number one, I think, comes to you, Mr. Butler.



## QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

**Questioner:** Mr. Butler, you concede, don't you, that about one-third of the world, almost a billion people, are now under the Kremlin? And you also concede, I believe, that it was Stalin that Lenin very much feared and warned his people against Stalin. In other words, Lenin didn't even trust Stalin. Now we have a third of the world communist. All right, are we going to take them into fellowship, and wouldn't that be exactly as if I owned a jewelry store, invited in a robber to stay all night long, or if I was afraid of a thief, I would say here is the combination to my safe and then by majority vote, are we going to allow them to gradually increase their majority, working from the inside and then take over everything?

**Mr. Butler:** As far as I understand it, I am afraid that I must

have failed to make myself clear. What I am suggesting is not to take them into fellowship at all, but to arrange so that they will not violently assail us. I want a policeman to stand and prevent them from using violence against us.

**Questioner:** But does this look as though the robbers have taken over the policemen instead of the policemen taking over the robbers?

**Mr. Butler:** No, it doesn't.

**Questioner:** Mr. Streit, how could an Atlantic Union stop piecemeal conquest by communists of the parts of the non-communist world that are outside that Atlantic Union?

**Mr. Streit:** I am very glad you put that question, because that is the real danger zone now. The Atlantic alliance has given us some measure of protection in Western Europe, but from Morocco, all the

way through to Indo China, there is a zone of troublement, and we will have new Koreas there if we do not form such a union. We forget that one of the factors that led to the Korean War was that the British had one policy on Red China, we had another. It was an open invitation to move ahead there. We have the same situation in Iran, in various other countries in that belt that I just mentioned. Until we have a common government there, with a common foreign policy in this field, we are bound to be pitted one against the other in these zones until we encourage other new Koreas there.

*Mr. Butler:* That's precisely my point with respect to Mr. Streit's proposal — This North Atlantic Coalition, or Union, or whatever it is that he suggests.

*Mr. Streit:* I am not suggesting a coalition; I am suggesting a federal union.

*Mr. Butler:* Very good. Simply offends that area of which he spoke, is immediately construed by the Russians and Chinese as a coalition against them, and abandons that entire area and the majority of mankind to the Russians and their subversions.

*Mr. Back:* Can you make a very quick reply, Mr. Streit?

*Mr. Streit:* Well, I think that there is nothing at all in that. I think that these peoples there are delivered to the Russians as we have been seeing happen in China.

I heard the same argument ten years ago about China, if we had an Atlantic Union that would deliver China to the Reds. Well, we don't make the Atlantic Union, who's got China?

*Questioner:* Mr. Butler, how would a world government main-

tain an effective judiciary branch to administer its laws?

*Mr. Butler:* An effective judiciary branch? It's a difficult question, but you can frame a statute defining justiciable controversies for a court to decide upon compulsorily as a part of your charter, leaving beyond that an area of non-justiciable controversy in which some properly organized court of equity may make recommendations rather than compulsory decisions.

*Mr. Streit:* But they haven't yet got, if I may put in just one word. I don't believe we've yet got the Soviet on the International Court that now sits in the Hague.

*Mr. Butler:* Well, if we had the Soviet where we want them, we wouldn't be here to talk.

*Questioner:* Mr. Streit, since war is a world problem, how can anything short of a world-wide political organization hope to solve the problem of world war?

*Mr. Streit:* It can by the amount of power behind it. Now the force could be divided into material and moral force. The material power behind the United Nations is, for the largest part, within this group of Atlantic democracies that I mentioned. For enforcing anything in that field, we have to turn to these North Atlantic democracies. They have the industrial power; they have the military power; they have the raw material power. And I would say they also have the moral power, because the principles of human liberty and union which have developed in the West have a tremendous appeal all around the world. The trouble is we have not been applying the principle of union with liberty there in the West. We have not been practicing in that sense what we preach.

*Mr. Back:* All right, Mr. Butler.

*Mr. Butler:* If the United Nations or as you described them, the leading members of the United Nations, depend upon that organization for their security, what becomes of the United Nations? With all that concentration of power in that union the United Nations would become a shadow.

*Mr. Streit:* Quite the contrary. We would have a situation then in the world such as we have had in the Western Hemisphere for a good many years, thanks to the fact we have had the democracies of North America, of the 48 states in a federal system, that gave so much strength to the stabilizing free system in this hemisphere that we have an inter-American organization. It is not a shadow; it's been growing. But we have had no armament racing in the Western Hemisphere; we've had no international wars in the Western Hemisphere that have involved the rest of the world. It's because we got our strength, and a colossal strength, in one country here through federating the free. That's what we would do and can still do in the Atlantic.

*Questioner:* Mr. Butler, I would like to know what is to prevent a world dictator from emerging from a world government?

*Mr. Butler:* I suppose perhaps the application of the same system that prevents a dictator from emerging in this country. You arrange your governmental organization by a system of checks and balances so that one man cannot. And I daresay that in any conference looking toward any organization, our representatives would be just as astute and just as patriotic as any of us here and would be just as apt to foresee the contingency which you suggest and guard against it. I would think that any

other nation in the organization would fear the same things and their representatives would be just as astute to guard against it.

*Questioner:* Mr. Streit, wouldn't Atlantic Federal Union further antagonize the hostile countries and the in-between countries that would be left out of the Atlantic Federal Union, and therefore increase world conflict?

*Mr. Streit:* I don't believe at all that it would do that. I think that it would benefit these other countries far more than the present situation can possibly help them. The more we use the alliance system, as we do now, to get our security, the more it is going to cost us. If we turn to the federal system, we can cut our expenses and therefore have funds with which we can really develop a Point Four program in the countries you mention, and thereby gain their friendship more than we have even today.

*Questioner:* I want to ask Mr. Butler, in a world government how can the language and cultural barriers be effectively overcome?

*Mr. Butler:* The same way they are now in the United Nations.

*Questioner:* Mr. Streit, wouldn't creation of an Atlantic Union wreck the UN, creating a tail big enough that it would wag the dog?

*Mr. Streit:* I answered that question just a minute ago about the showing that in the Western Hemisphere the creation and development of a powerful federal union not only did not wreck the inter-American organization with the Latin American States, but built it up and strengthened it. It would do the same in the UN.

*Mr. Back:* Mr. Butler, do you want to make a comment?

*Mr. Butler:* Yes, that reference

to the union of American states illustrated what I have in mind and what I tried to say a while ago. The United States and Canada and Argentina were always shrinking from any effective Western Hemispheric organization, although perfectly willing to join the United Nations. It illustrates that it is much easier to get people to join a global organization than a regional one, because the big nations fear to be outvoted by the small, and the small are afraid of the domination of the big in the narrow organization.

*Mr. Back:* Thank you, Mr. Butler. Are you satisfied, do you want to follow up?

*Questioner:* No, wouldn't it be forming a power bloc that has caused world wars before?

*Mr. Butler:* We already have those power blocs here. The question is whether we are going to have them more in the control of the dictatorial countries and whether

the strength on the free side is going to be subject to this costly and uncertain method of alliance.

*Questioner:* Mr. Butler, how may the United Nations develop into a world government?

*Mr. Butler:* By change of its charter, in the process which its charter automatically calls for in 1955.

*Mr. Streit:* But Soviet Russia will veto that.

*Mr. Butler:* How do you know?

*Mr. Back:* Thank you very much, Mr. Butler and Mr. Streit. I'm glad you both had a last word. Thank you for your interesting discussion of tonight's topic. We want to express our appreciation to Mrs. Leonard H. Gussow, Executive Secretary of the Detroit Chapter of the United World Federalists, and Mrs. Lorna D. Hunter, the Publicity Chairman. Thanks also to James G. Riddell and his associates at Station WXYZ, the ABC affiliate for Detroit.



# FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

## Background Questions

1. What is the primary purpose of world government?
  - a. Is its *raison d'être* the maintenance of peace? Are world government and world peace synonymous?
  - b. If two-thirds of the nations accepted the federation idea, would that stop wars?
  - c. Would the formation of a part-world federation, without the Soviet Union and its satellites, diminish the danger of war?
  - d. Can we have a world government capable of maintaining peace with the present distribution of industrial might?
  - e. Must any world government, to prevent war, possess power greater than any single state or foreseeable combination of states?
  - f. Have not wars been fought to overthrow established constitutional orders where disagreement existed on basic issues? e. g. our Civil War.
2. Is world government or federation practical at this stage?
  - a. What are the chances of immediate agreement among the principal powers concerning the character of an international government?
  - b. What should be the basis of representation in any world assembly?
  - c. Can we establish a world government capable of making and enforcing world law? What sort of laws could a world legislature pass? Can legislation achieve international harmony?
  - d. What powers should nations be prepared to surrender at this time? e. g. control of foreign affairs, trade policy, armed forces, fiscal and monetary policy, communications systems, etc.
  - e. Must the formation of a world society precede the establishment of a world state? Is government only possible over like-minded peoples?
  - f. If so, does such a world society exist today?
3. Is world government a desirable goal?
  - a. Is it the only road to peace?
  - b. When two-thirds of the world population have never known the democratic process of the ballot, how can we be sure that a world government will be democratic rather than totalitarian?
  - c. Is peace more important to us than the maintenance of our basic rights and freedoms? If so, would not capitulation to Soviet dominance be the surest method of assuring peace?
  - d. What are the chances of world government becoming corrupt or absolute? What recourse would there be in this event?
  - e. Could a government with armed forces strong enough to police the world also enslave it?
4. Is the United States ready for world government?
  - a. Would we expect other nations to agree that the laws and institutions of the U. S. should be the basis for world government?

- b. How far would the American people be prepared to go in altering their form of government and institutions?
- c. Is the U. S. willing to agree to common citizenship, a common currency and taxes, and a common standard of living within any federation?
- d. Does the present status of U. S. legislation in the areas of immigration, trade, international monetary policy, etc., indicate any great willingness to compromise?
- e. Are we prepared to have representatives of the American people constitute a minority in a world parliament?

5. Is the Soviet Union ready for world government?

- a. Is it likely that Soviet rulers would be interested in any world government which is not a union of Soviet Republics?
- b. Does the Soviet boycott of most international bodies hold out much hope for her participation in an over-all world government?
- c. Does Soviet rejection of the Baruch plan for control of atomic energy indicate hostility to a powerful world body?
- d. What is the current Russian interpretation of the Communist doctrine of the incompatibility of Communism and capitalism? Does this kind of theory preclude effective world federation?
- e. Do we have more to fear if Russia joins a world government than if she refuses to participate, in view of the Communist record in attempting to subvert or control national coalition governments?

Do all countries except the Soviet Union and its satellites want to join a new world organization?

- a. Are our allies willing to unite more closely with us—considering the extent of anti-American feeling and the fear of our power?
- b. Would Sweden, India, Iran, Turkey join a new federation that Russia opposed? Might we, in urging a stronger world organization, be forcing them into the Russian sphere of influence?
- c. Do the difficulties in forming a European Union foreshadow even greater difficulties in establishing a world federation?

Should a world government be built on the foundations of the United Nations?

- a. If so, what would happen if Russia refused to participate? Would she be dropped or would she be likely to leave?
- b. Can we get a world organization by simply rewriting the U. N. Charter?
- c. Would two plainly defined worlds (assuming they could be accomplished) be preferable to the world as it is?
- d. Or, is it better to have a weak organization in which Russia would participate?

Does the campaign for world government at this time militate against the prestige and efficiency of the United Nations?

Does the United Nations represent the widest area of possible agreement in the world today?

1953

## "TOWN MEETING BULLETINS" ON RELATED SUBJECTS

The following Town Meeting Bulletins on various aspects of world organization and cooperation provide a record of informed opinion during recent years. Copies may be ordered from Town Hall, New York 36, New York. Bulletins in Volumes 14, 15 and 16 are 10c each; those in Volumes 17 and 18 are 15c each.

### VOLUME 14

No. 2 "SHOULD THE UNITED NATIONS BE REVISED WITH OR WITHOUT RUSSIA NOW?" Rep. Brooks Hays, Ely Culbertson, A. H. Feller, Rep. Jacob K. Javits. (Broadcast from Lexington, Kentucky, May 4, 1948.)

No. 13 "DOES MILITARY PREPAREDNESS MEAN SECURITY?" Brig. Gen. Ned Schramm, Vera M. Deane, Admiral Richmond Kelly Turner. (Broadcast from San Francisco, California, July 20, 1948.)

### VOLUME 15

No. 21 "IS A PACIFIC UNION PRACTICAL AND POSSIBLE NOW?" Miguel Cuaderno, Father William F. Masterson, S. J., Gil J. Puyat, Peter Grim. (Broadcast from Manila, Philippines, September 20, 1949.)

No. 50 "DO WE HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE COLD WAR?" Marquis Childs, Sen. Ralph E. Flanders, Clarence Streit. (Broadcast from Charlottesville, Virginia, April 11, 1950.)

### VOLUME 16

No. 26 "HOW SHOULD THE UNITED NATIONS DEAL WITH FUTURE AGGRESSION?" Abraham H. Feller, H. V. Kaltenborn. (Broadcast from Bolling Field, Washington, D. C., October 24, 1950.)

### VOLUME 17

No. 41 "IS THE WEST LOSING THE SUPPORT OF THE MIDDLE EAST?" Hector McNeil, Hussein Kamel Selim Bey, Vincenzo Sheean, Lionel Gelber. (February 5, 1952.)

No. 42 "ARE WE TRYING TO DOMINATE OUR EUROPEAN ALLIES?" Louis Fischer, Eldridge Haynes, Henry J. Taylor. (February 12, 1952.)

### VOLUME 18

No. 3 "HOW CAN THE WESTERN DEMOCRACIES AVOID WORLD WAR III?" Sen. John W. Bricker, Owen J. Roberts. (Broadcast from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May 20, 1952.)

No. 13 "IS THE UNITED STATES BY-PASSING THE U.N.?" Thomas J. Hamilton, Porter McKeever. (August 12, 1952.)

No. 37 "CAN WE HOLD THE WESTERN POWERS TOGETHER?" Rep. Jacob K. Javits, Rep. John M. Vorys. (Broadcast from Chicago, Illinois, February 3, 1953.)

No. 39 "HOW CAN WE CONVINCE THE WORLD OF OUR BELIEF IN BROTHERHOOD?" James A. Michener, Edward Hunter. (Broadcast from Scranton, Pennsylvania, Feb. 17, 1953.)

No. 40 "IS THE UNITED NATIONS THE WORLD'S BEST HOPE FOR PEACE?" Sen. John Sherman Cooper, Rep. Charles Kersten. (Downers Grove, Illinois, February 24, 1953.)